



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,268	03/04/2002	Gordon K. Chang	SVOXP003	5167
22434	7590	11/08/2007	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER LLP			NGUYEN, STEVEN H D	
P.O. BOX 70250			ART UNIT	
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			PAPER NUMBER	
			2619	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			11/08/2007	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/086,268	CHANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steven H.D Nguyen	2619	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/25/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. Claims 1-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maroulis (USP 6584094) in view of Ford (USP 6463051) and Roger (USP 5946386).

Regarding claims 1 and 5, Maroulis discloses a communication system comprising a public switched telephone (PST) (Fig 1, Ref 113) network; an internet protocol (IP) network (Fig 1, Ref 117); a private branch exchange (PBX) (Fig 1, Ref 103) with a telephone (Fig 1, Ref 101) coupled thereto to route a telephone call over the PST network (Fig 2C, ref 223); and a voice gateway (Fig 1, Ref 109) coupled to the PBX and to the IP network to route a telephone call over the IP network (Fig 2C, Ref 227). Maroulis fails to disclose the voice gateway configured to support a plurality of numbering plans, accepting a number entered via a calling telephone by a

user in accordance with one of a plurality of numbering plans; translating the number into the IP address of one of the plurality of voice gateways; and routing the telephone call from the calling telephone to a called telephone and a User CTI control mechanism having a browser interface. In the same field of endeavor, Ford discloses the voice gateway configured to support a plurality of numbering plans, accepting a number entered via a calling telephone by a user in accordance with one of a plurality of numbering plans; translating the number into the IP address of one of the plurality of voice gateways; and routing the telephone call from the calling telephone to a called telephone. (Fig 2, Ref 54 is a database for translating the telephone number plans such as international and National numbering plans, See col. 3, lines 47 to col. 4, lines 10; col. 5, lines 10 to col. 6, lines 47 and Table 1 and 2 is the examples for numbering plans). However, Maroulis and Ford fails to disclose a user CTI control mechanism an interface via which each of a plurality of particular users can configure a CTI application to logically associate a computer and a gateway telephone in physical proximity to the computer with the telephonic identity of that particular user, and including integrating enterprise wide directory information into the operation of the CTI control mechanism with respect to that particular user, wherein the enterprise wide directory is a directory of named objects, including users, network devices and network services. In the same field of endeavor, Roger discloses a user CTI control mechanism an interface (Fig 1, Ref 110) via which each of a plurality of particular users (Fig 1, Ref 114) can configure a CTI application to logically associate a computer and a gateway telephone (Fig 1, Ref 101) in physical proximity to the computer with the telephonic identity of that particular user (Fig 6-9), and including integrating enterprise wide directory information (Fig 1, Ref 215) into the operation of the CTI control mechanism with respect to that particular user, wherein the

enterprise wide directory is a directory of named objects, including users, network devices and network services (Fig 6-9, Name, Fax “device”, call forward “service”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to apply a method and system for using a computer for configuring another computer and accessing the database as disclosed by Roger into the teaching of Ford which teaches a method and system for mapping a plurality of numbering plans with the IP address of the gateway or mapping dialing pattern with another number into the teaching of Maroulis which suggests a routing table of a gateway must be use to map the telephone number with IP address of the destination gateway. The motivation would have been to reduce the long distance cost.

Regarding claim 3, Ford discloses an enterprise wide directory information coupled to the voice gateway, and wherein the voice gateway is configured to access the enterprise wide directory and to control the telephone to support the plurality of numbering plans (Fig 2, Ref 54).

Regarding claim 4, Ford discloses the plurality of numbering plans supported includes at least one numbering plan from a group consisting of: a uniform numbering plan (UNP); an enterprise numbering plan (ENP); a PSTN numbering plan; and a direct trunk group access code (Col. 7 and 8, Tables 1-2).

Regarding claim 6, Ford discloses a gateway database coupled to the plurality of voice gateways, the gateway database having the IP addresses of the plurality of voice gateways stored therein, and wherein the step of translating the number comprises steps of accessing the gateway database with one of the plurality of voice gateway and associating the number with an IP address in the gateway database. (Fig 2, Ref 54 and See col. 7, table 1 is used to translating dialed number to a destination gateway and associating a number with IP address).

Regarding claim 7, Ford discloses the step of associating the number with an IP address comprises the step of manipulating a digit of the number (Col. 6, lines 37-47 and Col. 7-8, tables 1-2).

Regarding claim 8, Ford discloses translating the number includes the step of translating a number from at least one numbering plan from a group consisting of: a uniform numbering plan (UNP); an enterprise numbering plan (ENP); and a PSTN numbering plan; and a direct trunk group access code (Col. 7 and 8, Tables 1-2).

Regarding claim 9, Ford discloses the step of routing the telephone call comprises the step of controlling the plurality of voice gateways to route the telephone call from a first voice gateway over the IP network to a second voice gateway (Col. 6, lines 1-24 and Col. 7, lines 14 to col. 8, lines 54).

Regarding claims 2 and 10-11, Marouslis and Ford fail to disclose the voice gateway is coupled to the PBX via a call status-call control link to control operation of the telephone. However, Ford discloses gateway control the PBX to route incoming call to called telephone over PSTN (Col. 8, lines 33-54) and Rogers discloses a call status and control link between the PBX and gateway for control operation of the telephone and routing the incoming call at the second gateway to the telephone at local PBX or over PSTN (Fig 1, Ref 219 is link between the PBX and gateway for controlling and monitoring the operation of the telephone and Col. 39, lines 1-15).

Since, a call status and control link between the gateway and PBX is well known and expected in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to apply a call status and control link between the PBX and gateway

Art Unit: 2619

as disclosed by Rogers into the teaching of Marouslis and Ford . The motivation would have been to distribute the incoming calls to the PBX.

4. Claims 12-13 and 14-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maroulis, Ford and Roger as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, and further in view of Petty (USP 6337858).

Marouslis, Roger and Ford fail to disclose the interface is a browser interface which is a browser interface of the computer to be logically associated with the gateway telephone. In the same field of endeavor, Petty discloses the interface is a browser interface, which is a browser interface of the computer to be logically associated with the gateway telephone (Col. 5, line 54-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to apply a browser interface being logically associated with a telephone gateway as disclosed by Petty in the system of Marouslis, Roger and Ford.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/5/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

6. The applicant states that the prior arts fail to disclose a database which is similar to database "directory" of the applicant because the applicant's database is inherently different from the prior arts "stated by the expert of the applicant during the interview" and based on the submitted prior arts such as 6016499; SLAPD and SLURPD Administrator's guide and LDAP. In reply, Ford discloses a database which includes named objects dialed pattern and IP address of the network device and Roger discloses a directory database which includes named objects

Art Unit: 2619

includes users, network devices and network services (Figs 6-9, Name "user", Fax device "network device", call forward "network service"). The database of the prior arts discloses the limitation of the database of the applicant because the specification of the application does not disclose how two databases are distinguished from each other.

7. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the different between the database of the application and the database of the prior arts) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2619

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven H.D Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3159. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jayanti Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Steven H.D Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2619